

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 20, 2010

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 5, 2010

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2009–10 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 1901

Introduced by Assembly Member Ruskin

February 16, 2010

An act to ~~amend Section 66012~~ *add Chapter 3.3 (commencing with Section 66125) to Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code*, relating to postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1901, as amended, Ruskin. Postsecondary education: Master Plan for Higher Education.

Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, sets forth, among other things, the missions and functions of California's public and independent segments of higher education, and their respective institutions of higher education, in the context of the goals of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. Among other things, the act expresses legislative intent that the fixed master plan approach in the development of public postsecondary education be replaced by a continuous planning process that includes prescribed elements.

This bill would ~~add a needs-based assessment conducted by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education to the list of prescribed elements~~ *the report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education to the Donahoe Higher Education Act. The bill would add the findings and recommendations of the joint committee with respect to a higher education policy framework, universal access to higher education, affordability of higher education, fiscal and*

programmatic accountability of higher education, coordination and articulation of higher education, and financing of higher education.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: ~~yes~~-no.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 *SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares that, in its*
2 *report entitled “Appreciating Our Past, Ensuring Our Future: A*
3 *Public Agenda for Public Higher Education in California,” the*
4 *Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education made*
5 *all of the following findings:*
6 *(a) Our review marks the 50th anniversary of California’s*
7 *Master Plan for Higher Education. We convened in large measure*
8 *because of the widespread concern that our system of public higher*
9 *education is now at risk.*
10 *(b) The Master Plan was, and remains, a comprehensive policy*
11 *framework. Upon its advent and in the decades following, it*
12 *signaled an unparalleled commitment to higher education of*
13 *unrivalled size and scale. Through planned and coordinated growth,*
14 *it mandated the pioneering principles of universal opportunity and*
15 *universal access.*
16 *(c) In our estimation, nothing has been more responsible over*
17 *the past several decades for the quality of life in California and*
18 *for California’s economic prosperity than our system of higher*
19 *education.*
20 *(d) During our comprehensive hearings, there have been no*
21 *experts to argue that California’s economy and social fabric can*
22 *now benefit from a contraction of either educational opportunities*
23 *or educated people. Indeed, our systematic review of higher*
24 *education, with broad public and stakeholder testimony, confirms*
25 *that California’s future depends on an even more effectively*
26 *educated people. Private investment and growth are dependent*
27 *upon an ever expanding number of women and men ably prepared*
28 *to contribute and compete in the global marketplace, adding value*
29 *through their superior knowledge, imagination, and skill.*
30 *(e) In light of this challenge, this committee now reaffirms the*
31 *essential tenets of the Master Plan: universal access, affordability*
32 *and high quality.*

1 (f) However, we also believe that the Master Plan must be
2 regarded as a living document. In many ways, California has
3 transformed since the inception of the Master Plan. Therefore, in
4 order for our state and people to meet the challenges of the twenty
5 first century, we will need the vision and courage to ensure our
6 system of higher education adapts when necessary to meet the
7 demands of the new century and the needs of the society that
8 sustains it.

9 (g) Our hearings have demonstrated that, after five decades of
10 success, our system of higher education is now threatened. The
11 system will not continue to be effective automatically. It requires
12 our attention and support.

13 (h) After objective and close scrutiny, we assert that the findings
14 set forth in Chapter 3.3 (commencing with Section 66125) of Part
15 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, accurately
16 describe what our people and state require from our public system
17 of higher education to ensure California's success in the coming
18 decades.

19 SEC. 2. Chapter 3.3 (commencing with Section 66125) is added
20 to Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, to read:

21
22 *CHAPTER 3.3. JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR*
23 *HIGHER EDUCATION*

24
25 *Article 1. An Overarching Policy Framework*

26
27 66125. A system to provide clear, concise statewide goals or
28 outcomes for California higher education attuned to the public
29 interest of the people and State of California:

30 (a) The State of California has no articulated, comprehensive
31 statement of goals for California's system of higher education.
32 The Master Plan articulates values but not a set of public policy
33 goals based upon the outcomes required to meet the needs of our
34 state and our people. The lack of such goals makes it difficult to
35 develop systems of criteria for advancement or systems of
36 accountability.

37 (b) Statewide goals, including the workforce needs of the state,
38 are essential for the effective functioning of our system of public
39 higher education, to adequately complement the work of institutions

1 *comprising the fourth segment which includes private colleges*
2 *and universities.*

3
4 *Article 2. Universal Access*
5

6 *66128. Our need for higher education that is accessible to all*
7 *eligible California students:*

8 *(a) In order for California to compete in a global marketplace,*
9 *replace the baby boomer generation, and ensure a cohesive and*
10 *democratic multicultural society, the state must continue to support*
11 *the unique genius of California's original 1960 Master Plan for*
12 *Higher Education, namely its commitment to universal access for*
13 *every qualified student. This access provided our state and people*
14 *the distinction that enabled us to become the world leader in higher*
15 *education.*

16 *(b) Given the economic needs of our state and the labor-market*
17 *needs of our economy, open access gives us the greatest possibility*
18 *of meeting those long-term needs. In addition, in a state as diverse*
19 *as California, the maintenance of this promise gives hope to all*
20 *Californians who wish to attain a higher education. This hope is*
21 *essential to our success and cohesion as a people.*

22
23 *Article 3. Affordability*
24

25 *66130. Our need for higher education that is affordable to our*
26 *California students:*

27 *(a) Affordability must be established within a clearly articulated*
28 *and agreed upon framework of shared cost, between the student*
29 *who benefits directly from a quality education and the public, for*
30 *whom the student's education is an investment for the public good.*
31 *As a practical matter in the real world, the absence of affordability*
32 *makes the achievement of universal access an impossible dream.*

33 *(b) Our need is to take into consideration the entirety of the*
34 *costs accruing to students and their families with regard to*
35 *participating in higher education, the manner in which we*
36 *recognize and balance the individual private and the overall social*
37 *benefits of higher education, and the extent to which we are willing*
38 *to subject our students to a future burdened by large loan debt.*

39 *66131. Our need for a financial aid strategy that meets our*
40 *goals:*

1 *California should adopt clear metrics for measuring whether*
2 *our goals are achieved by our financial aid policies. In designing*
3 *those financial aid policies, we should evaluate the use of*
4 *incentives that can help us reach our desired outcomes.*

5
6 *Article 4. Accountability--Both Fiscal and Programmatic*
7

8 *66133. The establishment of statewide goals for California*
9 *higher education attuned to the public interest of the people and*
10 *State of California will enable increased accountability across*
11 *and within systems. Such increased accountability, with increased*
12 *efficiencies, must be both fiscal and programmatic.*

13 *66134. Our need for a new focus on completion and results:*
14 *It is no longer sufficient for our primary focus to be upon getting*
15 *our students into our system of higher education. Our systems must*
16 *lead our students systematically and readily to complete their*
17 *courses of study in a timely manner. Best estimates show that,*
18 *unless we improve our outcomes, by 2025 we will fall over one*
19 *million postsecondary degrees short of the number needed for a*
20 *robust economy in a global marketplace.*

21 *66135. Our need for simultaneous commitment to quality higher*
22 *education, to maintain California's distinction and our capacity*
23 *to keep California competitive in our now globalized economy:*

24 *(a) The pledge of California's original Master Plan for Higher*
25 *Education included, along with universal access and affordability,*
26 *the assurance of quality.*

27 *(b) Quality will be required in order for California to provide*
28 *higher education that will serve to keep California competitive in*
29 *our global economy, especially because of the tripling now by both*
30 *our global competitors, India and the People's Republic of China,*
31 *of the annual number of Ph.D.s in science and technology above*
32 *those produced by the entire United States.*

33 *(c) In this regard, it is essential that the dimension of "quality"*
34 *be examined and articulated, especially according to the definition*
35 *of quality as "those capacities and skills that are essential for*
36 *preparing Californians to live and work constructively in this 21st*
37 *century."*

38 *66136. Our need to close the achievement gap between*
39 *advantaged and disadvantaged students and communities:*

1 *Our need for an educated populace capable of filling the*
2 *necessary jobs to maintain a globally competitive economy requires*
3 *education of disadvantaged communities traditionally underserved.*
4 *The system must be accountable for closing the achievement gap*
5 *in ways that do not require or allow restricting access to*
6 *disadvantaged communities.*

7 66137. *Our need for utilizing technology to meet our fiscal*
8 *and programmatic challenges:*

9 *As new technologies arise we must be flexible and open to new*
10 *methods of higher education delivery and to the use of data systems*
11 *that both provide information about outcomes and create efficiency*
12 *in operations.*

13 66138. *Our need for increased transparency:*

14 *Transparency must be increased as part of an accountability*
15 *system focused on meeting statewide goals. Transparency will help*
16 *us find the optimum balance between administrative costs, teaching*
17 *costs, and other expenses.*

18
19 *Article 5. Effective Coordination and Articulation*
20

21 66140. *Our need for coordination and efficiency in our delivery*
22 *of higher education with sufficient authority placed in a*
23 *coordinating body:*

24 *The State and people of California do not have unlimited*
25 *resources to fund our system of higher education. Hence, it is*
26 *essential that we have some designated agency with the role,*
27 *responsibility, and capacity for advising the Legislature and*
28 *Governor, the segments of higher education, and the California*
29 *public with regard to essential coordination and needed efficiency*
30 *in our delivery of higher education.*

31 66141. *Our need for an agreed-upon system of simple, ready*
32 *articulation, between our segments of higher education, grounded*
33 *in a transfer associate degree:*

34 (a) *The original California Master Plan for Higher Education*
35 *expected that our three public segments of California's higher*
36 *education would operate as a system, with prescribed*
37 *differentiation of functions, yet all collaborating to facilitate and*
38 *ensure the steady progress of each and every student from*
39 *preparation through accessibility onto completion.*

1 ***(b) The State and people of California do not have the luxury***
2 ***of expending resources and time in an unnecessarily complex***
3 ***system of articulation among our segments of higher education.***
4 ***We need instead for all stakeholders in our respective segments***
5 ***to come together and adopt an agreed-upon, readily understood,***
6 ***and effective system of articulation, namely a transfer associate***
7 ***degree.***

8 ***(c) This student-centered approach will help students move***
9 ***more quickly toward their goals.***

10 ***66142. Our need for adequately preparing our students to***
11 ***undertake higher education:***

12 ***(a) While this dimension is primarily the responsibility of our***
13 ***California K-12 schools, their well-being and success are***
14 ***interdependent with our system of higher education, both in what***
15 ***higher education demands in the way of preparation by our K-12***
16 ***systems, and because our system of higher education prepares***
17 ***almost all of the educators who will operate our systems of K-12***
18 ***education.***

19 ***(b) Hence, it is essential that our system of higher education***
20 ***pay explicit attention to its roles and responsibilities as an effective***
21 ***partner in adequate preparation of students for admission to, and***
22 ***success in, higher education, and in the effective preparation of***
23 ***teachers for our K-12 system.***

24 ***66143. Our need for advancing career technical education, in***
25 ***both K-12 and higher education:***

26 ***The partnership between K-12 and higher education should***
27 ***include advancement of rigorous career technical education in***
28 ***both K-12 and community colleges, so that students who do not***
29 ***choose to seek a four-year degree may have the benefits of***
30 ***productive careers, helping eliminate the stigma often attached to***
31 ***those not seeking a four-year degree or graduate study.***

32
33 ***Article 6. Sufficient Financing***
34

35 ***66145. The test of our goals, aspirations, commitment, and of***
36 ***our capacity to ensure the future well-being of the State and people***
37 ***of California is to be found in the arena of funding, and whether***
38 ***and how we in the Legislature, together with the Governor and***
39 ***the people of California, prove willing and able to provide the***

1 *funding essential to meeting the needs of the California system of*
2 *higher education.*

3 66146. *Our need to establish and articulate the nexus between*
4 *public investment and public benefit:*

5 *California needs a sound financing mechanism aligned with*
6 *statewide goals to ensure that our state's needs are met. In*
7 *determining the funding commitment, a clear nexus must be*
8 *established between public financing and the economic benefits*
9 *to the state, so that both the level of public investment and the*
10 *return on that investment are articulated and verifiable.*

11
12 *Article 7. Moving Forward*
13

14 66150. *Our need for the support of the people of California*
15 *for our committee's Public Agenda for Public Higher Education:*

16 *It is essential, as we complete our work and file our report with*
17 *its findings and recommendations with respect to the future of*
18 *California higher education, and do our very best to shepherd our*
19 *recommendations into enactment and successful implementation,*
20 *that we recognize the importance of a comprehensive strategic*
21 *action plan for enlisting the active and ardent commitment and*
22 *support of the people of California. Toward that end, our public*
23 *agenda for higher education must clearly articulate the correlation*
24 *between public investment and public benefit.*

25 ~~SECTION 1. Section 66012 of the Education Code is amended~~
26 ~~to read:~~

27 ~~66012. It is the intent of the Legislature that the fixed master~~
28 ~~plan approach in the development of public postsecondary~~
29 ~~education be replaced by a continuous planning process that~~
30 ~~includes:~~

31 ~~(a) A legislative study of California postsecondary education~~
32 ~~at 10-year intervals to reevaluate the planning process and provide~~
33 ~~guidelines regarding goals, societal needs, and general missions~~
34 ~~of public higher education and its components.~~

35 ~~(b) Continuous planning by a state commission including a~~
36 ~~five-year plan that is to be updated annually.~~

37 ~~(c) A needs-based assessment conducted by the Joint Committee~~
38 ~~on the Master Plan for Higher Education.~~

O